

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FOI/PA
DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET
FOI/PA# 1327519-0

Total Deleted Page(s) = 12

Page 5 ~ b3;
Page 6 ~ b3;
Page 7 ~ b3;
Page 8 ~ b3;
Page 9 ~ b3;
Page 10 ~ b3;
Page 11 ~ b3;
Page 12 ~ b3;
Page 13 ~ b3;
Page 14 ~ b3;
Page 15 ~ b3;
Page 16 ~ b3;

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
X Deleted Page(s) X
X No Duplication Fee X
X For this Page X
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

is a humdinger! In fact, we are willing to give a year's subscription to *U. S. A.* to any reader who can start reading "The Pentagon Case" and not finish it.

From the strictly literary point of view, these three books are not works of art. They are not books to be read because of the way things are said, rather they are books that must be read because of what is said. In each of these books, the professional publishing and editing job could have been much better done. But the publishers' spirit and enterprise in making them available is a service of great worth.

"The Pentagon Case" lays bare a situation that is troubling many thoughtful Americans—the plight of patriotic military men who are victims of the Socialist-Communist campaign to demoralize our armed forces and to destroy their prestige and authority.

From my own research, I know that much of what Colonel Victor J. Fox (a pseudonym) depicts is true. The fiction written by him is strange, but the truth behind this fiction is stranger still. In fiction, Colonel Fox has broken through a silence barrier to sound an alarm against subversive forces stealthily striving to confuse reasonable Americans with slurs on the military system in our nation. Having broken down discipline, authority, respect, and high standards of achievement and conduct in most of our public schools (and many "progressive" private ones), these subversive forces are now seeking to break down these good qualities in our armed forces.

Americans have grown accustomed nowadays to reading about why Johnny can't read or spell or add two-and-two; let us pray they won't soon be reading about why Johnny can't man a gun or fly a plane or heed an order. Otherwise, some day, Johnny and his pals Tom and Dick and Harry might not come marching home. Defenseless and demoralized, they might find themselves stone cold dead in a foreign place or else in forced attendance at a Communist indoctrination course.

"The Pentagon Case" ought to be read by every member of veterans' organizations in our country, and by every member of the D.A.R., Colo-

nial Dames and Pro America Society. Once this piece of "fiction" is in their good hands, they'll know what to do about the situation revealed and how to do it!

In the fight against the evil forces fighting to weaken our armed forces, Robert Morris' "No Wonder We Are Losing" is indispensable. Face-to-face with those persons who practice what J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, describes as "the menace of deceit," Mr. Morris has had unique experience in dealing with subversives and with hardened pleaders of the Fifth Amendment before civic and Congressional investigating committees.

As Chief Counsel to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Mr. Morris reached the conclusion "that witnesses claimed privilege [on the Fifth Amendment] only when they believed that the Subcommittee had the evidence to impeach them. That was my own working conclusion with respect to the claim of privilege."

This is a highly important statement. Carefully, and by citing testimony, Mr. Morris explains the basis for his having reached this conclusion and he establishes this basis as valid.

From now on, no serious discussion of the Fifth Amendment should take place without a thorough study of Mr. Morris' lucid analysis.

"Democracy Versus Communism" by Kenneth Colegrove is a text book and has also been published in a trade edition. Probably this is because such a book is needed equally by people in school and by people who need to do their homework without having to go back to school.

Like Mr. Morris' book, Kenneth Colegrove's volume is replete with most lucid analysis.

Believe it or not, Kenneth Colegrove has written a chapter on economics—"Capitalism Provides Economic Freedom"—without using social science jargon culled from a made-in-America scrap-bag of Great Depression Marxist Maxims.

If this text book could be put into the hands of the bright young intellectuals at our colleges and universities who are under the tutelage of Great Depression Economists, doubtless young eyes would pop out of young heads at the sight of such unfamiliar, radical and naked words as *risk, competition, profits, private property, service, and free market*. It is positively startling to see these words in their original naked state, stripped bare of the adjectives "unfair" and "extortionate" and "monopolistic." Any day now, I expect to see a denunciation of Professor Colegrove as an "anti-intellectual."

As a matter of fact, any day now I expect to read that the three books listed in this review are evidence of a dangerous new trend toward "McCarthyism." The pundits who take their intellectual clues from such Great Depression Halls of Fame as the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies and the Social Science Research Council will try their best to ignore "No Wonder We Are Losing" by Robert Morris, "The Pentagon Case" by Colonel Victor J. Fox, and "Democracy Versus Communism" by Kenneth Colegrove. But, unable to keep the silence barrier clamped down, these pundits will sooner or later be forced to pay attention to these three books. They command attention because they are filled with an urgent message to Americans: Let us pledge our lives, our fortunes and our honor in the fight for democracy against communism.

U. S. A.

An American Magazine of Fact and Opinion

Vol. V

No. 4

February 28, 1958

TRUTH WILL OUT!

DEAR READERS:

As you know, it is not the custom of *U. S. A.* Magazine to use harsh or vituperative language. *U. S. A.* believes that the word "lie"—meaning deliberate falsehood—is extremely harsh. Ever since it was founded, *U. S. A.* has used the word "lie" to denote only deliberate falsehood told by Communists and criminals.

Now, however, *U. S. A.* has received a document which compels us to report to you that a lie about the United Nations has been told to the American public and has been repeated again and again.

This lie is that there are no secrets at the United Nations and consequently no need to fear or investigate Communist subversion and espionage at the U. N.

U. S. A. now possesses a "restricted" official U. N. summary record of a "closed" U. N. meeting (a meeting not open to the press or to any unauthorized U. N. personnel) which proves conclusively that there are vitally important secrets and secret documents at the U. N.

We believe it is our duty to publish an extract taken from this official U. N. summary record, issued at U. N. Headquarters, January 9, 1958, of statements made to the U. N. Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary by Mr. Andrew Cordier, an American, who is Executive Assistant to the U. N. Secretary-General.

Mr. Cordier was invited to appear at the closed meeting to explain matters pertaining to the case of Povl Bang-Jensen, a Danish political affairs officer suspended from his U. N. employment, because he felt honor bound not to turn over to anyone at the U. N. a list of Hungarian patriot-witnesses and other papers entrusted to him personally.

Mr. Cordier made an effort to persuade the Special Committee that all Bang-Jensen's papers would be in perfect safekeeping at the U. N. These papers are now burned as a result of widespread press support for Mr. Bang-Jensen.

In the statement to the Special Committee, Mr. Cordier made the revelations concerning the United Nations which you will find on the next page.

Sincerely,

THE PUBLISHER

U. S. A.

P.O. Box 134
Lenox Hill Station
New York 21, N. Y.

Please enter the following Subscription for one year:

Name

Street

City

☐ U. S. \$10.00 ☐ Foreign \$12.00 ☐ 6 mos. Trial \$5.00

Kindly make checks or money orders payable to: U. S. A. Publishing Co., Inc.

U.S.A.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE PROBLEM OF HUNGARY
PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTY-FIRST MEETING (CLOSED)

Held at Headquarters, New York
on Tuesday, 17 December 1957, at 3:15 p.m.

Page 10 . . .

Mr. Cordier (Executive Assistant to the Secretary-General) said that . . . Classified documents fell into two categories. The first category were confidential documents usually of a political character. The Secretary-General was exceptionally careful to ensure that they were not made available except in very rare cases. Such documents were, for instance, those relating to such matters as the work of political missions and the Secretary-General felt that their disclosure might at times reopen old wounds and prove injurious to the objectives of the United Nations. Consequently, any request for such documents, even from the most reputable quarters, would either be rejected outright or dealt with in the first instance by the Executive Assistant in consultation with the Legal Counsel and the head of the department concerned. And even if they decided that there was a *prima facie* case for making the documents available, the Secretary-General's final approval was always necessary before they were released. . . .

When documents were in the second or most highly classified (secret) category, such as those under discussion, no member of the Secretariat had access to them and they were under the personal surveillance of the Secretary-General. In the twelve years of the existence of the United Nations, no leakage of information involving such a document had ever occurred. . . .

Laid bare, Mr. Cordier's statement shows there are secrets and secret documents at the U. N., and that the Secretary-General can withhold them from most reputable persons, even when the U. N. Legal Department itself states there is a *prima facie* case for making the documents available.

This amounts to absolute censorship. It can result in a denial of due process by the United Nations, which disclaims sovereignty but which has drafted a Covenant on Human Rights.

This also raises the question whether a U. N. Secretary-General has ever withheld or can now withhold from Member States of the free world documents which, in his personal opinion, were or could be "injurious to the objectives of the United Nations" where full partnership with Communists is mandatory under the U. N. Charter.

Finally, it should be noted that on December 16, the very day before Mr. Cordier asserted there never had been a leakage of secret documents during the entire existence of the U. N., Secretary-General Hammarskjold was forced publicly to disclose the dismissal from long-time U. N. employment of a Ceylonese charged with alleged acts of espionage in 1957, including the act of having turned over to a Russian some secret information concerning the U. N. investigation of the Hungarian situation. The Russian was then First Secretary of the Soviet delegation to the United Nations.

Luckily, this is one Socialist plot that failed. When the hoped-for attack did not come, the "game" was abandoned. Had the plot succeeded—as other Socialist plots have succeeded—there would have been violence and terrible bitterness.

Perhaps some of the young people who took part in this plot were "idealists" believing that what they were scheming was noble. But I believe that the plotters and planners were fully aware of the possible dangers of their actions, and that they actually hoped for as much disturbance and violence as possible.

Little can be added to Jack Mabley's censure of these Socialist youths. "Perhaps," he concluded, "it made the football players feel important to tie up scores of policemen on Sunday. That puts them in the class with a rapist on the loose, or a runaway girl who can take up the time of 1,000 policemen for a week."

Mr. Mabley is to be commended for his reporting and commenting on the plot. He relates that in response to his article he received a flood of letters vilifying him as a "coward," "hypocrite," "intellectual lightweight," "louse" and "phony."

In a follow-up article, Mr. Mabley observed "from my communication from people of 'liberal' viewpoints, I think they regard themselves as absolutely immune to error. Anyone who disagrees with them is regarded with anger or condescension. The average Ku Kluxer probably has a more open mind than the average 'liberal'."

What mature, thoughtful Americans need to inquire about is how many college students in our country support Socialist activities such as the Calumet Park plot. Can American youth be deceived into believing that it is heroic and noble to foment violence, hatred and bitterness in order to achieve what the Socialists describe as "social justice"?

The evidence shows that most of our nation's young people reject the schemes and appeals of avowedly leftist groups. Nevertheless, there are too many who do support Socialist activities and they can, I believe, be roughly divided into two types: those who are excellent leaders and organizers, and those who are ex-

tremely naive. It is the few who are gifted with leadership ability who spark the Socialist activities and they cooperate closely with the adult Socialist leaders and planners.

The efforts of the United Socialist Front are making the Communist leaders' goal of world domination easier to achieve. Since the Moscow Youth Festival, the Socialist youth in our country are urging more strongly than ever that Communist leaders have no aggressive or imperialist plans, but want only peaceful coexistence. At the same time, the young Socialists are fomenting ill will and hatred among Americans, and are trying to multiply the divisive effects of racial bitterness and class resentment. And all this harmful work is done in the name of "social justice" and of "humanitarianism."

What the Socialist youths tried to do at Calumet Park was done by the same methods used by leftist agitators in every country where they wish to weaken the government and overthrow it. Schemes such as that devised for racial violence at Calumet Park in Chicago will be used again in this city and in other American cities and small communities.

In "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" Gibbon wrote: "I have reserved for the last and most potent and forcible cause of destruction of the empire, the domestic hostilities of the Romans themselves."

To prevent the decline and fall of our Republic, we Americans must resist the divisive pressure now brought to bear on us by leftist and extremist groups, for they are more dangerous to our security and well-being than the combined military might of all the Communist nations.

Due to pressure from the Socialist United Front, divisive schemes will now be hatched with greater frequency. In December 1957, as Jack Mabley reported in the *Chicago Daily News*, the Calumet Park plot fizzled largely because police and civic authorities were on the alert, and the local residents exercised self-control. Then, too, it was wintertime and most people were indoors.

Next time—if authorities and public are less alert—will the Young Socialists fail?

LITERARY LOOKOUT
ALICE WIDENER

BREAKING THROUGH SILENCE
BARRIER

If you wish to break through a silence barrier laid down by some book reviewers of the *New York Times*, *New York Herald Tribune* and *Saturday Review*, a barrier apparently laid down by persons wishing to hush the outcries of experienced and informed anti-Communists, then go to the nearest bookstore and insist on getting the following books:

NO WONDER WE ARE LOSING, by Robert Morris, published and distributed by The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y., 230 pp., \$2.50.

THE PENTAGON CASE, by Col. Victor J. Fox, Freedom Press, 520 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., 247 pp., \$3.95.

DEMOCRACY Versus COMMUNISM, by Kenneth Colegrove, D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., Princeton, N. J., 424 pp., \$4.95.

These three books comprise a trio in the literary form of an autobiography, a fictional mystery tale, and a textbook. The main theme of these books is the truth about communism. In Robert Morris' "No Wonder We Are Losing" the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth is told by the author, a former Officer in Charge of the Counter-Intelligence Section, 3rd Naval District (New York and New Jersey), a former Municipal Judge in Manhattan, and recently Chief Counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

In Col. Victor J. Fox's "The Pentagon Case" the truth underlies fiction which has a right to embroider but not warp truth.

In Professor Kenneth Colegrove's "Democracy Versus Communism" the truth triumphs for all to see.

Each of this trio of anti-Communist books is passionately interesting; each carries a message to Americans and a desperate appeal for awakening to clear and present danger. As is to be expected, the books by a former Judge and by a Professor are exceedingly restrained and dispassionate. Also, as is to be expected, the mystery story "The Pentagon Case"

STORY BEHIND A PLOT THAT FAILED

by STUDENT X
University of Chicago

(Editor's Note: For obvious reasons, it is necessary to conceal the identity of the author of this article who is doing graduate studies in sociology.)

To try to keep track of the Socialist United Front program for youth in America today, I recently attended several Socialist youth meetings in Chicago. It was at one of these meetings that I learned of the Calumet Park plot.

The *dénouement* of the plot was ably reported by Jack Mabley of the *Chicago Daily News*, December 6, 1957, under the caption "A Race Story That Fizzled." Perhaps it is best to tell the first part of my story mostly in Jack Mabley's words and by beginning at the end.

"Newspapers are criticized for printing news of crime or violence, for dwelling on the negative rather than the positive," wrote Mabley. "Now read about something that didn't happen. It didn't happen last Sunday afternoon."

"In Calumet Park," Mabley continued, "fifteen young men were going through the motions of playing a touch-tackle football game. Eight [of the players] were white and seven were colored. Watching the game were thirty-three uniformed park policemen. Scattered around the park were plainclothes policemen. At the nearest city police station, twenty-five patrolmen stood by."

Calumet Park is located in a changing residential area of Chicago. Last summer a bitter racial disturbance erupted in Calumet Park which threatened to spread throughout the city. The city officials had welcomed the coming of winter, hoping that inactivity in the park would allow inflamed tempers to cool and that the threat of large-scale, bloody rioting would diminish.

A policeman who witnessed the Sunday afternoon football game in December told Jack Mabley: "They didn't have officials or rules or uniforms or spectators. They didn't seem to know a football from a taffy

apple. One of them tried to punt the ball and missed three times. They tried to play the game, and they'd keep looking around, like they expected something to happen. Well nothing happened. The game got slower, they kept looking around, and after thirty-five minutes they took one more look, and decided to go. That was the end of it."

These young men did indeed expect "something to happen." I know that they ended their game because of disappointment over the fact that the expected did not take place. It is misleading to call what did happen at Calumet Park a game. Rather, it was a deadly serious business.

A few weeks before Mr. Mabley's *Daily News* article appeared, I had attended a meeting of the "Young Socialists" of Hyde Park. I had heard these young Socialists plan the December "game" and I know what they wanted to happen.

"Nothing happened at Calumet Park last Sunday," wrote Mr. Mabley, "because of the good sense of the much-maligned residents of the southeast section of Chicago, and because of the efficiency of the park and city police."

"The football players had notified the Park District they intended to use the field Sunday. They said they were students at Roosevelt University and the University of Chicago. They could have played in Grant Park or on the Midway or in Jackson Park. Instead they traveled all the way to Calumet Park, which was the scene of a violent racial outbreak last summer. Their intentions seem obvious."

"I judge they are extreme liberals." Mr. Mabley's judgment is correct. These students were members of the Young Socialists League which, by their own claim, is "a Marxist group."

Mr. Mabley also judged the purpose of the "game" correctly. "The city said it had racial tension under control," he wrote. "They were going to test it."

I know that the Young Socialists staged the "game" in Calumet Park in the hope of precipitating racial violence.

There were about twenty-five young people present at the particular meeting at which the racial violence was plotted. The discussion that evening was to be on some phase of Marxist social theory. Most of the students present showed that they were dedicated Socialists.

The "business" of the meeting was attended to first. The recognized leader of the group was somewhat older than the others present, and he appeared to be far cleverer than they. Six young Negro boys in their middle teens sat stiffly along one wall. These were the "special guests" of the Young Socialists.

The leader told the group that he had a plan to "reclaim Calumet Park for all the people of Chicago." The plan was simple, he said, but he needed help. Volunteers were needed for an interracial football game to be held in Calumet Park. The purpose, said the leader knowingly, was not really to play football. He himself confessed that he had not played the game for years. The reason for holding the game, he said, was to draw an attack from the people of the neighborhood who would be using the Park that afternoon, and thereby to worry and embarrass the city officials who were trying desperately to prevent such violence from breaking out.

There was no doubt in the minds of the planners that there would be violence. All volunteers for the game, said the leader, had to pledge to offer no resistance and to suffer passively when the attack came.

By this means the Young Socialists intended to represent themselves as defenders of "social justice," and to put the blame for trouble on others. They decided to warn the police to be on hand, however, so that the Socialist youth would not themselves have to suffer any more physical punishment than absolutely necessary to accomplish their purpose.

FEBRUARY 28, 1958

Vol. V No. 4

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

- Truth Will Out 1
Bats In The U.N. Belfry?
EDITH KERMIT ROOSEVELT. 3
Story Behind A Plot
That Failed
STUDENT X 6

LITERARY OUTLOOK

- Breaking Through Silence Barrier
ALICE WIDENER 7

Publisher: ALICE WIDENER

U. S. A. is published every other week. Address: P. O. Box 154, Lenox Hill Station, New York 21, N. Y. Copyright in the United States, 1958, by the U. S. A. Publishing Company, Inc. Alice Widener, President, N. A. Andersen, Newton H. Fulbright, Vice-Presidents; Mildred Edmonds, Secretary and Treasurer.

Rates: Ten dollars a year in the United States; twelve dollars a year elsewhere.

BATS IN THE U.N. BELFRY?

by EDITH KERMIT ROOSEVELT

Wags at the United Nations recently wrote a jingle to be sent as a Valentine greeting to the three-man investigating committee in the Povl Bang-Jensen affair:

NEU-roses are red;
Melancholia's blue
I'm schizophrenic—
What are YOU?

The jingle was thought appropriate in view of the effort now underway to convince the press and public that Povl Bang-Jensen, who served as Deputy Secretary to the U.N. Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary, is emotionally unstable or having a nervous breakdown or suffering from "a psychological lapse."

For Mr. Bang-Jensen's refusal to turn over to top executive officers at the United Nations a secret who's who list of Hungarian witnesses against Communist terror in Hungary—a refusal which the *Saturday Evening Post* says protected "the honor of the anti-Communist West"—he was suspended from his employment as a senior political affairs officer in the U.N. Secretariat on December 4, 1957.

The behind-the-scenes and on-scenes campaign to discredit this forty-eight-year-old Dane by casting doubt on his mental and emotional stability would appear to justify the deep anxiety that many Americans have felt over our own mental health laws.

According to reliable sources, a week before his suspension, Mr. Bang-Jensen, who has always enjoyed and now enjoys excellent health, was suddenly ordered by his superiors to see Dr. Szeming Sze, medical director of the U.N., for a check-up. It was learned that Dr. Sze had been informed by some of Mr. Bang-Jensen's executive superiors that the Danish official was "highly nervous" and needed medical treatment. Mr. Bang-Jensen visited Dr. Sze. The verdict was a clean bill of health. But this did not stop the whisper campaign. Rumors continued to circulate throughout the entire upper echelon of the U.N.

that Mr. Bang-Jensen was neurotic, "overworked", "odd" and undependable.

It is obvious that the Communists and their fellow-travelers will stop at nothing to try to recapture the ground lost, particularly among the so-called "colonial peoples," by their ruthless suppression of Hungarian nationalists.

The public first learned of the aspersions cast on Mr. Bang-Jensen through a report contained in a press release, (SG/651) January 15, 1958, of the Bang-Jensen case investigating committee to the Secretary-General. The report was signed by the members of the committee: Ernest A. Gross, chairman (who was formerly Assistant Secretary of State under Dean Acheson), Constantin A. Stavropoulos, U. N. legal counsel, and Philippe de Seynes, U. N. Under-Secretary for the Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

The release states (pp. 3, 4, 5):

A problem of the character involved in Mr. Bang-Jensen's conduct in this matter has never before arisen in the history of the organization. This fact, standing by itself, suggests that the essence of the matter lies in the aberrant conduct* of an individual rather than in the demonstrated capacity of the United Nations Secretariat to assure that confidential documents are dealt with in a manner appropriate to their special character.

On page 7 of this same release, the Committee charged that, in his interview with the Committee, Mr. Bang-Jensen revealed an ignorance of "rational" security procedures, and reported that when traveling he would sometimes conceal the papers in the hotel room in some "odd" manner. The Committee then declared:

We are forced to conclude from our study of the record of lengthy and patient interviews with him conducted by Dr. Protitch [a Yugoslav] the Under-Secretary for Political and Security Affairs, that Mr. Bang-Jensen is not open to rational* persuasion on this matter.

* Emphasis added.

Was use of the words "aberrant" and "rational" and "odd" merely a carelessly considered choice, or was it a deliberate attempt to raise doubts in the minds of newsmen about the mental stability of the politically troublesome Mr. Bang-Jensen?

Reliable sources say that at a later press conference conducted by Mr. Ernest A. Gross, an accredited U.N. correspondent asked the Committee Chairman if it were not true that his use of the term "aberrant conduct" implied that there was mental disability on the part of Mr. Bang-Jensen, and if this implication were so, the correspondent continued, wasn't that libel or slander?

These same sources say that in replying to this question, Mr. Gross said the phrase wasn't libel or slander, and that the Secretariat had used every reasonable manner of persuasion with Mr. Bang-Jensen, but they couldn't take him by the hand and lead him to a psychiatrist.

Why should it be necessary to have world opinion believe Mr. Bang-Jensen is not "rational," but is "aberrant," "odd," hence inevitably unreliable and incapable of telling the truth and exercising good judgment?

Perhaps Mr. Gross and other committee members are merely relying on "the line" they have been handed by a Yugoslav about Mr. Bang-Jensen because—as loyal supporters of the U.N.—they view the Danish official as a road block against peaceful coexistence with the U.S.S.R. Also, there may be the desire on the part of some U.N. officials to cover up leaks from secret documents in the U.N. Secretariat, leaks that may have caused part of Bang-Jensen's apprehension about handing over his papers.

Since the Committee transcripts of its interviews with Mr. Bang-Jensen have not been made public, it is difficult to get his side of the story.

U.N. Kangaroo Court?

In the press release of January 15, Messrs. Gross, Stavropoulos and de Seynes refer to themselves as a "committee," although in his previous statement of December 13, 1957, Mr. Gross had said: "We

are not, of course, either a formal group or a committee in the sense of being guided by any rules and regulations of the Secretariat. The only rules that we shall follow will be those of common sense, justice and fairness."

Acting on Mr. Gross' assurance that he was merely having an informal and friendly talk with his superiors in the U.N. hierarchy, Mr. Bang-Jensen appeared twice before the Committee without a lawyer, not realizing that he was in reality appearing before an investigating committee in the full sense of the word.

Actually, the Secretary-General acted in violation of the U.N. staff rules by bringing in an outsider—Mr. Gross—to investigate the Bang-Jensen case. And Mr. Gross himself, an able lawyer, must have been well aware of this. It is to be noted that in a recent case involving the extremely grave matter of the Ceylonese U.N. employee charged with espionage, the Secretary-General did not bring in an outsider and the three-man committee to investigate the case was composed of U.N. staff members only.

It would seem that in the Bang-Jensen case, the United Nations is proceeding in a manner more suited to a kangaroo court than an organization devoted to international justice. And if the extra-legal tactics used should prove to be ineffective in getting rid of the distinguished Dane, there is still a chance that doubts cast on his mental stability could prove effective.

The U.N. press release of January 15 concludes with this somewhat menacing statement: "Our committee is currently concluding its review of *other** aspects of Mr. Bang-Jensen's conduct relating to his association with the Special Committee on Hungary. . . ."

What are the *other* aspects slated for investigation? Will he be labeled as "mentally ill"?

Red Ruse

The trend to label political opponents as "mentally ill" has long been a favorite ruse in the Communist bag of tricks, and has been

* Emphasis added.

commented on by members of Congress. Recently Rep. F. Edward Hébert (D., La.) said: "A typical Communist smear is: When a man gets up to testify, and particularly a former Communist, is to say he is insane or an alcoholic."

A psychiatrist, Dr. Carl Binger, raised questions as to Whittaker Chambers' sanity during the perjury trial of convicted Alger Hiss.

Leftist groups, too, have sought to label those who disagree with their views as mentally ill. Dr. Harry A. Overstreet, a spokesman for leftist pseudo-liberal elements in the mental health movement, describes as follows the "mentally ill" in his book "The Great Enterprise" published in 1952:

A man, for example, may be angrily against race equality, public housing, the TVA, financial and technical aid to backward countries, organized labor, and the preaching of special rather than salvational religion . . . Such people may appear normal in the sense that they're able to hold a job and otherwise maintain their status as members of society; but they are, we now recognize, well along the road toward mental illness.

What Dr. Overstreet describes, of course, is the prototype of millions of conservative people everywhere. Are these folk to receive insulin shock treatment or lobotomies?

The Congressional Record of June 4, 1957, carries a speech made by Rep. Usher L. Burdick (R., N. D.) who said:

All over the country, there seems to be a movement designed to take away from persons designated as mentally ill their individual rights guaranteed to all citizens under the Constitution. The right to trial by jury, to legal representation and to habeas corpus, are being by-passed in what appears to be a determination to "railroad" more and more people into mental institutions.

Dr. John E. Grimes, who headed a nationwide investigation of mental institutions on behalf of the American Medical Association, told a Senate and Interior Affairs subcommittee two years ago that "only a small percentage of asylum inmates require confinement" and that "personal convenience or avarice—sometimes fear—becomes the determining factor as to who shall be confined."

Under existing commitment procedures in our country and those

advocated by some politically motivated "mental health" groups, will it soon be possible to get rid of either non-conformists or of politically troublesome persons like Mr. Bang-Jensen by declaring them to be "mentally ill" and obtaining their confinement?

Model For Smears

Let us examine our commitment procedures, which, as they exist in many states, are based on "A Draft Act Governing Hospitalization of the Mentally ill," a document distributed in 1950 by the Federal Security Agency (now Health, Education and Welfare) and presented to the forty-eight states and adopted by more than half of them.

Called a "model" act and partly drafted according to advice from the National Association for Mental Health, this legislation defines a mentally ill person as "an individual having a psychiatric or other disease which substantially impairs his mental health." Such a definition could be applied to almost anybody.

In some cases, the Draft Act would replace a jury trial with hearings conducted by a panel of psychiatrists.

Among those persons wishing that psychiatrists instead of jury-laymen would have the final say on who is mentally ill is Dr. Julius Schreiber, who in 1955 was chairman of the Washington, D. C., Mental Health Association, and who pleaded the Fifth Amendment that year when questioned by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee about his Communist affiliations.

In his pamphlet "The Durham Decision, A Beacon in the Dark" issued in 1956 by the National Association for Mental Health, Dr. Schreiber writes: "Let the psychiatrist say whether a man is of unsound mind and let him say so in the light of the latest scientific knowledge."

Surely some psychiatrist, perhaps Dr. Schreiber himself, might be found to declare Mr. Bang-Jensen of "unsound mind" based on the U.N. officials' views of his "aberrant conduct" in protecting the honor of the anti-Communist West. But, of course, should Mr. Bang-Jensen be prevented from getting a fair

hearing in the court of public opinion, then he most probably will be fired by the U.N. and it wouldn't be necessary to get him out of the way by "putting him away."

Should certain elements in the United Nations succeed in making their smears against Mr. Bang-Jensen stick, it will not only be a dark day for the middle-aged Dane with his American wife and five children, it will also be a jolt to those sincere and idealistic people the world over who still view the United Nations as a symbol of justice and human rights.

EXTRA!

U.S.A. EXCLUSIVE

February 20, 1958

Povl Bang-Jensen stands officially accused, by a U.N. Committee, of conduct that "departed markedly from normal and rational standards of behavior."

Thus Edith Kermit Roosevelt's fears concerning the possible smearing of Mr. Bang-Jensen—fears expressed in the foregoing article "Bats In The U.N. Belfry?"—have been substantiated.

On February 20, the *New York Times* carried the news: "DANE ACCUSED BY BOARD IN U.N.—COMMITTEE HEADED BY GROSS CHARGES INSUBORDINATION IN HUNGARIAN CASE." The *Times*' report ends with the statement: "The specific charges against Mr. Bang-Jensen were not made public."

This *Times*' statement is true. But fortunately, personnel at U.N. Headquarters are aware of *U.S.A.*'s press leadership in the Bang-Jensen case, a leadership recognized editorially by the *Saturday Evening Post*, January 25, 1958.

When *U.S.A.* was about to go to press, early in the morning of February 19, these U.N. personnel made available to *U.S.A.* the information that the Gross Committee's report on Bang-Jensen contains the accusation that his conduct "departed markedly from normal and rational standards of behavior."

The U.N. personnel who made this information available to *U.S.A.* are characteristic of those to whom its publisher dedicated her book "Behind The U.N. Front" (published by The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y., 1955) with the following tribute:

To the dedicated, freedom-loving men and women of all Member States in the United Nations who gave much of the information in this book to me—and to you.

On page eight of "Behind The U.N. Front" the publisher of *U.S.A.* wrote: "I did . . . a series of eight articles [in 1952-53, for The Freeman magazine] on the United Nations. . . . Almost immediately after publication of the first article . . . a flow of information from Secretariat members came to me. To my astonishment, I learned there was a kind of 'freedom underground' operating within the U.N. At the risk of their jobs, men and women with dependent families sent me accurate and documented information on the subversive activities of American and foreign Communists here in New York City, and in Paris and Geneva. Of course, I transmitted this information to the appropriate agencies of our government.

"Our country owes a debt of gratitude to the U.N. undergrounders that it can hardly repay. Their discretion, their courage and their loyalty to the highest ideals of liberty and justice are beyond praise."

Today, *U.S.A.*'s publisher adds to this her heartfelt gratitude to the freedom-loving U.N. personnel for their having brought the Bang-Jensen case to her attention, and for their continued cooperation.

U.S.A. is confident that the American press and public will safeguard the honor of the anti-Communist West by upholding ideals of liberty and justice in a successful defense of Povl Bang-Jensen against his U.N. detractors.

U.S.A. salutes Inez Robb of the *New York World-Telegram & Sun* for her magnificent column of January 31 about the Bang-Jensen case, and *U.S.A.* agrees with her judgment: "The Dane ought to have his job back with apologies."